

With the writer's compl.

FROM THE TRANSACTIONS OF THE ROYAL SOCIETY OF CANADA

SECOND SERIES—1903-1904

VOLUME IX

SECTION II

ENGLISH HISTORY, LITERATURE, ARCHÆOLOGY, ETC.

nwp
970.9
H648

TOTEMISM

A CONSIDERATION OF ITS ORIGIN AND IMPORT

By CHARLES HILL-TOUT

Hon. Secretary of the Ethnographical Survey of Canada, etc.

FOR SALE BY

J. HOPE & SONS, OTTAWA; THE COPP-CLARK CO., TORONTO
BERNARD QUARITCH, LONDON, ENGLAND

1903

NMP
970.9
H 648

VI.—*Totemism: A Consideration of its Origin and Import.*

By CHARLES HILL-TOUT.

Hon. Secretary of the Ethnological Survey of Canada, etc.

(Communicated by Honorary Secretary and read May, 19, 1903.)

Two years ago I had the honour to present to the Society a short paper on the subject of Totemism as it obtains in tribal society in British Columbia.

The scope of the present paper is more comprehensive; it aims at a consideration of the subject from a general point of view.

The doctrine of totemism has of late much exercised the minds of anthropologists, and there has been a considerable increase in the literature upon it. This has not, unfortunately, resulted in an acceptable solution of the problem of totemism, but rather the reverse. It has brought out in a painfully clear manner that American and European students hold widely-differing views upon the subject, and appear to look at the question from a fundamentally different standpoint. Even their terminology seems to have little in common.

This has apparently come about from the fact that students of this country have dealt with data drawn almost exclusively from American sources, while those of Europe seem to have fixed their attention more particularly upon data gathered in Australia and other parts of the world.

This would seem to suggest that the totemism of tribal man in America is different from that found among primitive peoples elsewhere. But this certainly cannot be the case. Totemism, wherever found, in its naked and virgin state, is demonstrably the outcome of the mind of savage man contemplating the relations existing between himself and his physical environment, that is of *anthropopathic* conceptions of the universe, and in its fundamentals must of necessity be everywhere the same. The difference, if difference there be, will be found to lie partly in the attitude of the student himself and partly in the fact that too much stress has been laid by certain European exponents of totemism upon subsidiary features of it, which, as I shall attempt to show, are not really essential elements, but only, more or less, local adjuncts or accidents, which differ materially in number and character in different centres and among different peoples. If these concomitants of totemism, mostly social, be set aside and the underlying concept be regarded alone, totemism will be seen to be the same in all parts of the world.

Pacific N. W. History Dept.
PROVINCIAL LIBRARY
VICTORIA, B. C.

13862

The American student may be said to possess a certain advantage over others in his study of the subject. Nowhere in the world has primitive man received such close and systematic study by trained observers as in this country, and nowhere can we find a wider or more varied range of culture than among the aborigines of this continent. Every condition of tribal society appears to exist here. There are tribes in the Matriarchal state, tribes under Patriarchal rule, and tribes in all stages of transition between the one and the other. He has, therefore, an ideal field for the study of primitive institutions and concepts and should, with due care, be able to arrive at the heart of things.

I will, therefore, begin this consideration of the subject by a brief statement of what is regarded by leading American students as the doctrine of totemism. And as the late Director of the Bureau of American Ethnology, so recently as July last set forth briefly in an article in *Man*, what may be considered the prevailing view of the doctrine in this country, I cannot do better than cite his statement of the case in his own words. He writes: "A group of Amerind tribes occupying a limited part of the Dominion of Canada and the United States are known as Algonquins; they belong to a distinct linguistic stock in which many languages are spoken. Among these tribes the word 'totem' or its variant is used, and these are the languages from which the word comes. The word is derived from a root which signifies clay. Among the Algonquian tribes clay was used to paint the face and body with the heraldic devices [that is the totem symbols] of a group of persons.... The group is composed of such persons as reckon consanguineal kinship only through the mother; thus, the mother and her brothers and sisters and their mother with her brothers and sisters, belong to the group, and the kinship may be reckoned in the same manner through an indefinite number of generations. This group we call a *clan*, but the Algonquians call it a *totem*, thus *clan* and *totem* are synonymous.... There are other tribes in which the clan group is replaced by what we call the *gentile* group. This group is like that discovered among the Latin tribes, and embraces those persons who reckon kinship through the father with his brothers and sisters, including their father and his brothers and sisters. Thus the mother's group and the grandmother's group are excluded.... When the second group is found we call it a *gens*.... In America we call the name of the clan and also the name of the gens its totem, and totemism is considered a method of naming. Among some tribes the child on coming to puberty takes a new name, and this name is called its totem.... In every tribe among the Amerinds societies are organized, which we formerly called 'medi-

cine societies' and then 'religious societies'. . . . These societies are also named, and the names of the societies are their totems, so that totemism pertains to individual names, to clan names, to tribal names, and also to society names.

"The name which the individual assumes at puberty is the totem name of the individual; it is also the name of the thing for which the individual is named. . . . When shamanistic societies are organized, their names are also their totems, and apply to the societies as well as to the things to which they are devoted. This is the Amerindian custom, and is also the custom of American students.

"In tribal society we find very interesting superstitions about names, for the name is held to be an inherent attribute or property of the thing; again, the object from which the puberty name of the individual is taken becomes his tutelar deity. In like manner the totem name of the clan, the gens, and the tribe severally become tutelar deities of these bodies. Such are the customs and superstitions of the Amerinds about names, and we call this doctrine of naming totemism."

Now at first sight this "doctrine of naming" seems to be lacking in scientific precision. Indeed, Major Powell's critics have found fault with it upon this very ground. One of them says: "it is difficult to see the advantage of a system of nomenclature where everything is called by the same name."¹ Another says: "I must confess to feeling a little bewildered by this terminology and I venture to think it will not prove of much service in advancing our knowledge."² But this is not really the case. To regard it in this light is to fail entirely to appreciate the American point of view.

To rightly comprehend how the word totem may logically and consistently include so many apparently diverse ideas we must examine into the nature of those ideas to see if they are really as diverse as they appear to be; and are not merely so many different expressions of a common underlying concept.

Upon analysis we find the following elements comprised under this "doctrine of naming":—

- A {
 - 1. The name acquired by a person during the puberty ceremonies.
 - 2. The object or thing from which the name is taken.
 - 3. The symbol or representation of the object.
- B {
 - 1. The name of a group of people united by ties of consanguinity.
 - 2. The object from which that name is taken.
 - 3. The crest or kindred-symbol or representation of the object.

¹ *Man.*, 1902, Article 85.

² Presidential address of Dr. A. C. Haddon before the Anthropol. Sect. of the B.A.A.S., Belfast, 1902.

- C { 1. The name of a "medicine" or "religious" society.
 2. The object or thing to which that society is devoted.
 3. The emblem, symbol or representation of that object or thing.

Now a brief examination of these categories shows us that the same concept underlies them all. In each we have the same three elements: name, object, and symbol. In each the object is the source of the name, and in each the object is the same thing, viz., a tutelary guardian spirit. It is in this concept of a ghostly helper or tutelary spirit that we find the connecting link. This is the essential element of totemism. "This is totemism" in its pure and naked state, i.e., shorn of its social accessories. And in applying the same name to all three elements we are, as Major Powell has shown, but following the custom of the natives themselves and regarding the subject from their point of view. In the Algonquian's mind, we may be sure there was no confusion in the application of the word *totem* to these several phenomena, for to him they were but different expressions of one and the same thing; nor need there be in the mind of the student when he has once rightly apprehended the concept which underlies the term.

In the philosophy of savage man the name of a thing is something more than a mere label, or mark of distinction; it is an essential part or attribute of the thing itself. It is of prime importance to appreciate this fact for a right understanding of it makes clear a good many strange and obscure customs and superstitions among primitive peoples. To adopt or receive the name of an animal or plant or other object, was in the mind of the savage to be endowed with the essence or spirit of that object, to be under its protection, to become one with it in a very special and mysterious sense. This becomes clear from a study of names and the customs and superstitions connected with them. Among these may be instanced the habit of avoiding personal names in direct address. Major Powell has recorded an interesting example of this. He was at one time travelling in company with a band of Flathead Indians, the young chief of whom was known to white men by the name Frank. Major Powell sought on several occasions to learn his Indian name, but could not succeed. He then endeavoured to notice the term by which the chief was addressed by others of the tribe, but invariably some kinship term was employed. One day, however, the chief and his wife quarrelled, and in her anger the wife called him Chuarumpik ("Yucca-heart"). Later, Major Powell referred to the subject and questioned the chief about it, who explained and apologized for the great insult his wife had heaped upon him by thus mentioning his name, but said that she was excused by the great provocation he had given her. The "insult" lay in calling him by his real or "mystery" name.

Everard F. im Thurn gives the following account of the name system of the Indians of Guiana, "which," says Mallory, "might have been written with equal truth about some tribes of North America":—"The system under which the Indians have their personal names is intricate and difficult to explain. In the first place, a name, which may be called the proper name is always given to a child soon after birth. It is said to be proper that the peaman or medicine-man, should choose and give the name. . . . The word selected is generally the name of some plant, bird or other natural object. But these names seem of little use, in that owners have a very strong objection to telling or using them, apparently on the ground that the name is part of the man, and that he who knows the name has part of the owner of that name in his power.¹

The close relation between the person and his name is again seen in the practices of shamans and witches. In their formulas relating to love and killing or maiming, the name of the victim or of the person whose affections it is desired to win, is always specifically mentioned; for the Indian believes that injury will result from malicious handling of his name as surely as from a wound inflicted on any part of his physical organism. "This belief," writes Mooney in his article on the 'Sacred formulas of the Cherokees,'² "was found among the various tribes from the Atlantic to the Pacific and has occasioned a number of curious regulations in regard to the concealment and change of names. Should his prayers have no apparent effect when treating a patient for some serious illness the shaman sometimes concludes that the name is affected and accordingly goes to water, with appropriate ceremonies and christens the patient with a new name. He then begins afresh using the new name."

Teit, writing of the Thompson Indians says: "It is believed that all animals have names of their own which may be revealed by the guardian spirits. The knowledge of these names gives a person additional power over animals. A man who, knowing the name of the grisly bear, for instance, addresses him, gains so much more power over him that the bear at once becomes gentle and harmless."³

In a note upon "The Religious Ceremony of the Four Winds or Quarters, as observed by the Santee Sioux," Miss Alice Fletcher remarks:

"A name implies relationship, and consequently protection; favour and influence are claimed from the source of the name whether

¹ Tenth Report of Bureau of American Ethnology, 1888-89, pp. 44-5.

² Seventh Annual Report Bureau of Amer. Eth., p. 343.

³ The Thompson Indians of B.C. Memoirs of the Amer. Mus. of Nat. Hist., Vol. II, p. 355.

this be the gens or the vision. A name therefore shows the affiliation of the individual; it grades him, so to speak, and he is apt to lean upon its implied power. . . . The personal name (and also the kinship term in some cases) among Indians therefore indicates the protecting presence of a deity, and must, therefore, partake of the ceremonial character of the Indian's religion."

The practice among some savages of interchanging names is founded upon the same or kindred beliefs. We also see another illustration of the same idea in the care and jealousy with which each family or clan guards and retains for its own peculiar use its own list of personal names. These names are regarded as peculiarly sacred, inasmuch as they are intimately connected with the lives and histories of their owners or their ancestors; and for an outsider to appropriate one of them would be the deadliest offence and would result in his speedy death.

It is clear from the foregoing, then, that an object and its name, particularly when that object is a "mystery" object, was one and the same thing in the eyes of the savage and hence his calling them by the same name.

And with regard to the third element of the categories, the symbol or representation of the object, it was the same thing. Nelson informs us that the Eskimo possess masks representing their totem animals, the wearers of which are believed to become actually the beings represented, or at least to be endowed with their spiritual essence.'

Dorsey, writing in his "Study of Siouan Cults," concerning the origin of the buffalo and their "mysterious" power says: "Therefore, when a man can hardly be wounded by a foe, the people believe that the former has seen the buffalo in dreams or visions and on that account has received mysterious help from those animals. All such men who dream of the buffalo *act like them and dance the buffalo dance. And the man who acts the buffalo is said to have a real buffalo inside him and a chrysalis lies within that part of the body near the shoulder blade.*"² Similar views are held by the Salish tribes.

Turner, writing of the religion of the Hudson Bay Eskimo, says: "The spirit [i.e., the tutelary guardian] is often in a material form in the shape of a doll carried somewhere about the person."³

Lynd, writing of the Dakotas, says: "Frequently the devout Dakota will make images of bark or stone, and after painting them in various ways and putting sacred down upon them will fall down and worship before them, praying that all danger may be averted from him

¹ Eighteenth Annual Report Bureau of Amer. Eth., pp. 394-5.

² Eleventh Annual Report Bur. Amer. Eth., 1889-90, p. 477.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 194.

and his. It must not be understood, however, that the Dakota is an idolator. It is not the image that he worships,.... *but the spiritual essence which is represented by that image, and which is supposed to be ever near it.*"¹

The coast tribes of British Columbia hold similar views; and the accounts that have been given of fetishism in different parts of the world everywhere reveal the same belief. The Polynesian taboo beliefs with regard to certain objects being the shrine or habitation of their gods is another illustration of this belief. On the island of Nukunono Fakaafu was a stone wrapped about with matting, and held so sacred by the natives that only the king durst view it, and even he only once a year when it assumed a fresh suit of matting. This stone or idol or fetish was termed by the natives the Tui Tokelau or Lord of Tokelau and was regarded as the personification of the god.² The Ark of the Israelites belongs to the same class of beliefs.

It becomes clear then that in the mind of the savage the name of a thing, the symbol or representative of that thing, and the thing itself is all one and the same. They are to him only so many different expressions of the same concept. Hence there is no inconsistency in his designating them all by a common name.

To follow the Algonquian custom, then, and call the several elements of our categories by one and the same term is, I submit, neither illogical nor inconsistent. But in order that this may become the more apparent it may be well to consider here briefly the nature of this fundamental concept of primitive man of which totemism, in one form or another, is everywhere the outward and visible sign. For, as I remarked in my former paper, we can best apprehend the philosophy of savage customs and beliefs when we view things from the point of view of savage intelligence.

A particularly suggestive and luminous exposition of the mental attitude of the Zuñi toward the universe is given by Cushing in his article on Zuñi fetishes in the Second Annual Report of the Bureau of Amer. Eth. As this report is now out of print, and as the Zuñi savage does not differ greatly from other savages elsewhere, it will not be out of place if I cite a few pertinent passages from it.

"The Zuñis," he writes, "suppose the sun, moon and stars, the sky, earth, and sea, in all their phenomena and elements; and all inanimate objects, as well as plants, animals, and men, to belong to one great system of all-conscious and inter-related life in which the degrees of relationship seem to be determined largely, if not wholly by the degrees of resemblance. In this system of life the starting point is

¹ Minn. Hist. Soc. Coll., Vol. II, pt. 2, p. 67.

² Turner, "19 years in Polynesia."

man, the most finished yet the lowest organism, at least, the lowest because the most dependent and least mysterious. In just so far as an organism, actual or imaginary, resembles his is it believed to be related to him and correspondingly mortal; in just so far as it is mysterious is it considered removed from him, further advanced, powerful and immortal. It thus happens that the animals, because alike mortal and endowed with similar physical functions and organs are considered more nearly related to man than are the gods: more nearly related to the gods than is man because more mysterious, and characterized by specific instincts and powers which man does not of himself possess.... In like manner the supernatural beings of man's fancy—the 'master existences'—are supposed to be more nearly related to the personalities with which the elements and phenomena of nature are endowed than to either animals or man; because like those elements and phenomena and unlike man and animals they are connected with remote tradition—and, therefore, are considered immortal."

To the above should be added the statement that all these beings are given by the Zuñis the forms either of animals, of monsters compounded of man and beast, or of man. The animal gods comprise by far the larger class.

Mrs. Erminnie A. Smith, writing in the same Report upon the "Myths of the Iroquois," remarks: "All the mysterious in nature, all that which inspired them with reverence, awe, terror, or gratitude, became deities or beings like themselves endowed with supernatural attributes, beings whose vengeance must be propitiated, mercy implored, or goodness recompensed." Riggs, writing on the Mythology of the Dakotas, remarks: "They pray to the sun, earth, moon, lakes, rivers, trees, plants, snakes, and all kinds of animals and vegetables—many of them say, to everything, for they pray to their guns and arrows—to any object artificial as well as natural, for they suppose that every object, artificial as well as natural, has a spirit which may hurt or help."¹

And Turner writes, concerning the beliefs of the Eskimo about Hudson's Bay: "All the affairs of life are supposed to be under the control of spirits, each of which rules over a certain element.... Each person is supposed to be attended by a special guardian who is malignant in character, ever ready to seize upon the least occasion to work harm upon the individual whom it accompanies."²

Bearing in mind, then, this attitude of savage man towards nature, and his intense belief in the activity and omnipresence of the "ghosts" of things, it is not difficult to perceive how the totem concept was

¹ Eleventh Annual Rept. Bur. Amer. Eth., 1889-90, p. 434.

² *Ibid.*, p. 194.

evolved. Surrounded as he felt himself with beings and agencies disposed rather to harm than to befriend him, and being unable by the limitations of his intelligence, to discern the true relations between causes and effects, he is led irresistibly to attribute all his blessings to friendly powers and all his ills to hostile ones. He assumes immediate causal relations where they do not exist, and not knowing or understanding the true causes of things takes for them some object in his immediate environment.

"A Kaffir broke a piece off the anchor of a stranded vessel and soon after died. Ever after the Kaffirs regarded the anchor as something mysterious, divine, and did it honour by saluting it as they passed by, with a view to propitiate its wrath."¹

The Yakuts, Wuttke informs us, first saw a camel during an outbreak of smallpox and in consequence pronounced the animal to be a hostile deity who had brought the disease among them.² These are typical cases of the way in which the savage reasons. To the Kaffirs the anchor was clearly the cause of the man's death; and to the Yakuts the camel the cause of the smallpox. There was no doubt in their minds. Did not the facts speak for themselves? Another savage connects some object in his mind with certain good fortune that has happened to him, and thereafter that object becomes his fetish, his tutelary deity to be consulted or appealed to in all emergencies. An American savage chose the crucifix and a little image of the virgin as his *manitus* after he had found, as he believed, that they had protected him on sundry occasions against the arrows of his enemies."³

It is then, in these beliefs common to savage man the world over that we find the *raison d'être* of totemism, and under this term I include the kindred phenomena of fetishism; for the explanation of the one is the explanation of the other. Between the fetish so-called and the totem, on its religious and magical side, that is, in its *essential* character, I can perceive no difference at all. They are equally the outcome of the *anthropopathic* apprehensions of the universe by savage man. So also is the *Taboo*, the religious ban of the Polynesians. Among American savages we find all three phases in various stages of development. In the list of personal totems of the Thompson Indians given by Teit in his Memoir on that tribe, and which I cited in my former paper, we find exactly the same objects, and they have the same characteristics as those which become the *fetish* of the African savage. Waitz's definition of the fetish is equally a definition of the personal

¹ Quoted by Schultze in his "Fetishism" from Alberti's, *die Kaffern*.

² Wuttke, *Gesch. d. H. I.* 72, cited by Schultze.

³ Charlevoix *Journal historique d'un voyage de l'Amérique Septentrionale*, Paris, 1774, p. 387.

Sulia of the Salish: A fetish, he says, is an object of religious veneration wherein the material thing and the spirit within it are regarded as one, the two being inseparable. And for the matter of that so also is that given by Dr. Tylor. "Fetishism," he writes, is "the doctrine of spirits embodied in, or attached to, or conveying influence through certain material objects."¹ Indeed, if one sought to give a definition of the *Sulia* of the Salish, or the "*wagube*" of the Omaha and Ponka, it would be impossible to find a more exact definition than this of Dr. Tylor. The only difference between the African fetish and the *Sulia* of the Salish, perceivable to the observer, is the manner in which they are severally acquired. Chance seems to be the chief factor in determining the acquisition of the African fetish, whereas among the Salish, dreams or visions are the usual source of their *Sulia*. This is also the manner of acquisition in several other North American tribes. But if the subject be regarded from a world-wide point of view we shall find that the totem or fetish is acquired in a variety of ways and that of these accidental coincidence determines a very large proportion. Among North American savages the dream or vision is the usual way, but not exclusively so. Totems are also frequently acquired by their owners by direct and personal contact with the object when out hunting or fishing. The origin of many of the clan totems of the North-west Coast tribes are accounted for in this way. Some American tribes chose their personal totems by a method of divination. The fetishes of the Zuñis, which take the place of the *Sulia* of the Salish, are chiefly stone objects, and as the tutelary deities of the Zuñis are mostly animals, these stone objects are the representations of them. The most highly-prized of them "are natural concretions in which the evident original resemblance to animals has been heightened by artificial means." All these fetishes are supposed to be either actual petrification of the animals they represent or were such originally. The Zuñis say concerning them: "Whomsoever of us may be met with the light of such great good fortune may see (discover, find) them and should treasure them for the sake of the sacred (magic) power which was given in the days of the new. For the spirits of the Wa-ma-à-hâ-i still live, and are pleased to receive from us the Sacred Plume (of the heart—Lâ-sho-a-ni), and sacred necklace of treasure (thlâ-thle-a); hence they turn their ears and the ears of their brothers in our direction that they may hearken to our prayers (sacred talks) and know our wants."² They are supposed to have originated in the following manner. In "the days of the new" the Sun-Father created from his own being

¹ "Primitive Culture" II, p. 132.

² Zuñi Fetiches. Second Annual Rep. Bur. Amer. Eth., p. 15.

two children. These, perceiving the weakness of mankind, "the finished beings" of the earth, sought to protect them from the "animals of prey" and whenever they came across in their wandering over the earth one of these animals, "were he a great lion or a mere mole," they struck him with the lightning of their magic shields and instantly he was shrivelled and burnt to stone. Then they thus addressed them: "That ye may not be evil unto men, but that ye may be a great good unto them have we changed you into rock everlastingly. By the magic breath of prey, by the heart that shall endure forever within you, shall ye be made to serve instead of to devour mankind."¹

On the Isthmus of Tehuantepec when a child was about to be born the relatives drew on the floor figures of animals, one after another, and the one that remained when the infant was born became its totem. A somewhat similar custom prevailed in Samoa.

The difference, then, between the "totem" here and the "fetish" there is clearly seen to lie mainly in the way in which they are severally acquired. In character they are everywhere the same.

It is not needful to dwell longer on this point. Already there is a pretty general concurrence of opinion among anthropologists that the fetish and the personal totem is one and the same thing; or, at any rate, that the two have their origin in the same animistic concept; the point in dispute is rather the relation existing between these and "clan totemism," which we must now proceed to consider.

In this country the majority of students hold the view that the "clan" totem is but a natural development along social lines, of the personal totem. And not only the clan totem, but the society or fraternal totem as well. They are irresistibly led to this conclusion from the data before them. The attitude of the clansmen and of the members of a society to their respective totems is everywhere seen to be the same as that of the individual to his personal totem and the same relation exists between them.

I pointed out just now in the analysis of the elements which enter into American totemism that the three series or categories are intimately connected by the common underlying concept of a solar spirit or ghostly helper, which in the first case is confined to the individual, in the second to the clan or gens, and in the third to the society or brotherhood. Now, it appears to me, that if we are able to discover a clear instance or two of a personal totem passing by inheritance to the family or relatives of its owner, and thus becoming a common, family totem, we shall be perfectly justified in assuming that the family totem may be enlarged into the clan or gens totem, inasmuch

¹ Zuni Fetiches. Second Annual Rept. Bur. Amer. Eth., p. 14.

as the clan or gens is but a group of families¹ connected by ties of consanguinity. The main objection brought against this view of the matter by Mr. Andrew Lang and others is that the personal totem is not transmissible or hereditary. But is not this objection contrary to the facts of the case? We have abundant evidence to show that the personal totem is transmissible and hereditary. Even among tribes like the Thompson, where it was the custom for every one of both sexes to acquire a guardian spirit at the period of puberty we find the totem is in some instances hereditary. Teit says in his detailed account of the guardian spirits of the Thompson Indians, that "the totem of the shamans are sometimes inherited directly from the parents;" and among those tribes where individual totemism is not so prevalent, as, for instance, among the coast tribes of British Columbia, the personal totem of a chief or other prominent individual, more particularly if that totem has been acquired by means other than the usual dream or vision, such as a personal encounter with the object in the forest or in the mountains, is commonly inherited and owned by his or her posterity. It is but a few weeks ago that I made a special enquiry into this subject among some of the Halkomelem tribes of the Lower Fraser. "Dr. George," a noted shaman of the Teil'q'e'ek, related to me the manner in which his grandfather had acquired their family totem, the bear; and made it perfectly clear that the bear had been ever since the totem of all his grandfather's descendants. The important totem of the *Sqoiàq*i which has members in a dozen different tribes of the coast and Lower Fraser Salish, is another case in point. It matters little to us how the first possessor of the totem acquired it. We may utterly disregard the account of its origin as given by the Indians themselves, the main fact for us is, that between a certain object or being and a body of people, certain mysterious relations have been established, identical with those existing between the individual and his personal totem; and that these people trace their descent from and are the lineal descendants of the man or woman who first acquired the totem. Here is evidence direct and ample of the hereditary of the individual totem and American data abound in it.

Miss A. Fletcher in her close and detailed study of the Omahas, was led to the conviction that the gentile totems of that tribe, and by implication those of others of the Siouan stock, were derived from the personal totems of leading members of the tribe. She writes: "As totems could be obtained but in one way—thro' the rite of vision—the totem of the gens must have come into existence in that manner and must have represented the manifestations of an ancestor's vision, that of a man whose ability and opportunity served to make him the founder

¹ I here of course use the terms "family" in its restricted sense as applied to the subdivisions of the clan and gens.

of a family, of a group of kindred who dwelt together, fought together and learned the value of united strength."¹

Dr. F. Boas was led to the same conclusion with regard to the totems among the Kwakiutl Indians. He writes: "We have to deal here with the elementary idea of the acquisition of a guardian spirit which has attained its strongest development in America. Its specific character on the North Pacific Coast lies in the fact that the guardian spirit has become hereditary. This is the case among the northern tribes of British Columbia. It is also the case among the Kwakiutl and among the Chinook."²

Ensign Niblack arrived at similar conclusions with regard to the clan totems of the Haida-Tlingit. He writes: "From their nature totems are in a state of flux. Clans tend to become phratries, split up into sub-phratries, sub-phratries decay and finally disappear. An individual distinguishes himself, becomes wealthy and hence a leading man of the village. His totem or indeed, his individual crest or sub-totem, may have been an obscure one. As he rises, its importance in the tribe rises with him. Under his successors the totem widens its numbers, influence, and finally eclipses other clan totems which eventually melt away or are incorporated with it. In this evolution we see the sub-totem grow into the clan totem."³

And if I may be permitted to refer to my own work, I may state that I was led independently to form the same opinion from my study of the Salish tribes before I was even aware that others had come to this conclusion.

This is likewise the view taken by the officers of the Bureau of American Ethnology and, as far as I have been able to learn, that of the majority of students on this continent.

There must be some force, I submit, in the evidence on this head which thus leads so many students, working independently of each other, to the same conclusion.

Some European students have clearly recognized this force. The author of "*Totemism*" in his consideration of Miss Fletcher's paper remarks in "*Golden Bough*,"⁴ "It is quite possible that as some good authorities incline to believe, the clan-totem has been developed out of the individual totem by inheritance."

Mr. N. W. Thomas is apparently inclined to go even further and take the same view as that suggested in my former paper, and more

¹ The Import of the Totem. (Salem Press, Mass., 1897).

² The social organizations of the Kwakiutl Indians. Report U.S. Nat. Mus., 1895, p. 393.

³ The Coast Indians of Southern Alaska and Northern B.C., Wash..

⁴ *Golden Bough* III, p. 419, note 5.

specifically dealt with here, but apparently from independent study of the subject, viz.: that "the basis of individual totemism seems to be the same as that of fetichism." Elsewhere in the same article he writes: "This view [i.e., of the indwelling obsessing spirit of the totem in its owner] suggests that the interpretation suggested for individual totemism can also be applied to clan totems."¹

And even Mr. Andrew Lang, writing in his recent paper on "The origin of Totem names and beliefs," remarks: "Though the attitude of a private person to his *nagual*, or of a magical society to its protective animal, may often closely resemble the attitude of the group to its hereditary totem, still the origin of this attitude may be different in each case."² Thus, while admitting the force of the evidence in this connection, he is led to explain it away or regard it as different, partly because he is under the impression that the personal totem is not hereditary, but more particularly because of a singular misconception he has regarding the transmissibility of male property and rights under matriarchy. He argues thus: Totemism is a phenomenon peculiarly characteristic of tribal society under mother-right, and though it may occasionally descend to the later state of father-right, it rightly belongs to, and had its origin under, the former. Now, under these conditions descent is reckoned in the female line; how then can a *man* become the founder of a family and transmit his personal totem to his children?" These are not his actual words, but I think he will admit that they state his position accurately. Thus, in his criticism of "Miss A. Fletcher's theory," he writes: "The conclusion of Miss Fletcher's valuable essay shows at a glance that her hypothesis contains the same fundamental error as that of Dr. Wilken, namely the totem of the kin is derived from the *manitu* or personal friendly object of an individual, a male ancestor. This cannot, we repeat, hold good for that early stage of society which reckons descent in the female line, and in which ancestors do not found houses, clan names or totem-kin." And in writing of the view expressed by myself, he says: "Mr. Hill-Tout has evolved a theory out of the customs of the aborigines of British Columbia, among whom 'the clan totems are a development of the personal or individual totem or tutelary spirit.' The Salish tribes, in fact, seek for '*Sulia*, or tutelary spirits,' and these 'give rise to the personal totem,' answering to *manitu*, *nyarong*, *nagual* and so forth. 'From the personal and family crest is but a step to the clan crest.' Unfortunately *with descent in the female line, this step cannot be taken*. Interesting as is Mr. Hill-Tout's account of the Salish Indians, we need not dwell longer on an hypothesis which makes village communities prior to the evolution of totemism."

¹ *Man*, August, 1902, Art. 85.

² *Folk Lore*, Vol. XIII, No. 4, Dec. 1902.

I remarked just now that the difference between the American and European views of the doctrine of totemism was due partly to the attitude of the students. This becomes clear from the above citations from Mr. Lang's article. He is unable rightly to appreciate the evidence brought together by American students in support of the views herein set forth, because of certain prepossessions. One of these, as I have shown, is his belief that the personal totem is not hereditary, and the other is that group totems could not have arisen from the personal totem as claimed by Miss Fletcher, myself, and other American students, because under mother-right men are never founders of families or clans or totems. The evidence which I offered of the evolution of family or group totems from personal totems, gathered with much care and caution by personal investigation among the Salish tribes, is summarily dismissed because these tribes are no longer under matriarchy. And in like manner Miss Fletcher's conclusions based upon a close and sympathetic study of a Siouan people are set aside because the Omahas are under patriarchal rule. Whereas American tribal society abounds in data which show that, although group totemism did in all probability first appear in the admittedly earlier matriarchal state, it may and *does* arise under any and all conditions of savage society. The particular form which totemism in any given tribe shall take depends entirely upon the social structure of that tribe. Under matriarchal conditions the social unit is the clan, and under patriarchal rule the gens. These severally occupy the place which is taken by the family group in later social organization. The clan and the gens totem, then, clearly answer to the family totem of village society; or rather the latter answers to the two others and all arise in the same way. But whereas under the clan and gens organization the group-totem is necessarily confined to those social units, in village society with descent counted on both sides of the house it spreads outside of the family into the tribe at large or even beyond it; for here the factor of affinity is operating as well as that of consanguinity. The main difference, then, between the group-totem of village society and that of the earlier states of clan and gentile organization, lies in the fact that the totem-groups of matriarchy and patriarchy are formed, strictly, in theory at least, on consanguineous lines, while those of the village state include within them those connected by ties of affinity as well as those of blood."¹

¹ We have been accustomed to regard the "village community" as the social unit of savages organized on the lines of the Salish peoples. Later and closer study of their social organization has led me to reject this view and regard the "family" as the real social unit. This family is composed of the elements of the other two more primitive states, the clan and gens, and

We have then a form of group-totemism for each stage of tribal society. Under mother-right with descent exclusively in the female line, we have what is commonly termed in this country "clan" totemism. Under father-right with descent exclusively in the male line, "gentile" totemism, and in village society, like that obtaining among the Salish tribes with descent on either or both sides of the house, we have still another form of group totemism, which for lack of a better term I will provisionally call "Kin" totemism. The *squoiaqi* totem, already alluded to and described by me in my report to the Committee of the Ethnological Survey of Canada on the Halkomelem division of the Salish, is an illustration of this form. This totem is said to have originated in the adventure of some woman with some lake "spirits," and by her marriage and that of her descendants has spread over all the Halkomelem tribes, and its members are now numbered by hundreds. I can perceive no difference between this *squoiaqi* brotherhood or kin-group and the clan groups of the northern Indians, except that in the latter case the group is theoretically composed of consanguineal relatives on one side of the house only, and in the former of the relatives on both sides of the house, affinitive ties being counted as well as consanguineous ones.

But to return to Mr. Lang's primary objection, that the evolution of the group totem cannot proceed from the personal, individual totem because in the more primitive forms of society where totemism originated "male ancestors do not found houses or clan names," descent being on the female side. As Mr. Lang has laid so much stress upon this argument and is able apart from it to appreciate the force of the evidence for the American point of view, if it can be clearly shown that his objection has no basis in fact, that his conception of the laws of inheritance under matriarchy is faulty, consistency must needs make him a convert to the American view. The singular error into which Mr. Lang has fallen in overlooking the fact that *male* property and rights are as hereditary under mother-right as under father-right, the only difference being that in the latter case the transmission is *directly* from the father to his offspring, and in the former *indirectly* from the maternal uncle to his sister's children. What is there to prevent a man of ability under matriarchy from "founding a family," that is acquiring an individual totem which by his personal success and prosperity is looked upon as a *powerful helper* and therefore worthy of regard and reverence? Under mother-right the *head* of the clan, is invariably a *man*, the elder male

includes the relations of both parents usually for six generations. Every tribe is composed of a greater or less number of these families, just as the tribes where clan and gentile organization prevails are composed of a greater or less number of clans or gentes.

relative on the maternal side; and the clan name is not so much the property of the woman as of her elder brother or her conventional "father," that is her maternal uncle. The "fathers" of the group, that is the maternal uncles, are just as much the heads and "founders of houses" and clans in the matriarchal state as under the more advanced state of patriarchal rule. And that they *do* found family and group totems the evidence from our northern coast tribes makes clear beyond the shadow of a doubt.

The oft-quoted case of the Bear totem among the Tsimshians is a case in point, and this is but one of scores that could be cited. The origin of this totem came about in the following manner: "A man was out hunting and met a black bear who took him to his home and taught him many useful things. After a lengthy stay with the bear the man returned home. All the people became afraid of him, he looked and acted so like a bear. Some one took him in hand and rubbed him with magic herbs and he became a man again. Thereafter whenever he went hunting his friend the bear helped him. He built a house and painted the bear on the front of it and his sister made a dancing blanket, the design of which represented a bear. Thereafter the descendants of his sister used the bear for their crest and were known as the Bear clan."¹

Who was the "founder of the family," here and the source of the clan totem? Clearly and indubitably the *man*; and so it invariably was as the study of the myths accounting for the clan totems plainly shows. It matters not, I may point out, that these myths may have been created since the formation of the clans to account for their origin, the point for us is that the *man* was regarded by the natives themselves as the "founder" of the family and clan. The founders of families and totem-crests are as invariably *men* under matriarchy as under patriarchy, the essential difference only between the two states in this regard being that under one the descent is through the "conventional father," under the other through the "real or ostensible father." Such being the case Mr. Lang's chief argument falls to the ground and the position taken by American students as to the origin of group-totems is as sound as before.

Having thus considered the American view of totemism and shown that the objections brought against certain features of it by Mr. Lang, and those who think with him, are groundless, we may now pass on to a consideration of the European view more particularly as set forth in recent publications in England.

Taking these in the order of time we have first to examine the view or rather views of Dr. Frazer, the author of "Totemism."

¹ Fifth Report of the Committee on the Physical Characteristics, etc., of the N.W. Tribes of Can., B.A.A.S., vol. 24. London, 1889.

Writing in the *Fortnightly Review* for April and May of 1899, under the heading of "The origin of Totemism," he remarks: "It may be well to begin by reminding the reader that a totem is a class of natural phenomena or material objects—most commonly a species of animals or plants—between which and himself the savage believes that a certain intimate relation exists. The exact nature of the relation is not easy to ascertain; various explanations of it have been suggested, but none has yet won general acceptance.¹ Whatever it may be, it generally leads the savage to abstain from killing or eating his totem, if his totem happens to be a species of animals or plants. Further, the group of persons who are kin to any particular totem by this mysterious tie commonly bear the name of the totem, believe themselves to be of one blood and strictly refuse to sanction the marriage or cohabitation of members of the group with each other. This prohibition to marry within the group, is now generally called by the name of Exogamy. Thus totemism has commonly been treated as a primitive system, both of religion and of society. As a system of religion, it embraces the mystic union of the savages with his totem; as a system of society, it comprises the relations in which men and women of the same totem stand to each other, and to the members of other totemic groups. And corresponding to these two sides of the system are two rough-and-ready tests or canons of totemism; first, the rule that a man may not kill or eat his totem animal or plant; and second, the rule that he may not marry or cohabit with a woman of the same totem. Whether the two sides—the religious and the social—have always co-existed or are essentially independent, is a question which has been variously answered. Some writers—for example, Sir John Lubbock and Mr. Herbert Spencer, have held that totemism began as a system of society only, and that the superstitious regard for the totem developed later through a simple process of misunderstanding. Others, including J. F. McLennan and Robertson Smith, were of opinion that the religious reverence for the totem is original, and must, at least, have preceded the introduction of Exogamy."

Now, on examining this view of totemism, we perceive that it differs from that given by Major Powell in several important features. First, great stress is laid upon the fact that a totem is always one of a class of objects and never an individual object; and herein Dr. Frazer distinguishes between a "fetich" and a "totem." That this distinction is more fanciful than real we have seen; we may, therefore, set it aside at once as not being an essential element of totemism. And secondly

¹ These remarks I need hardly point out after what has been said respecting the unity of American opinion on totemism apply only to the European schools.

that totemism before it can be accepted as such, must bear upon it certain signs manual, in other words, must exhibit certain features of a prohibitory character which are regarded as its "Tests" or "Canons." These are:

1. The Canon of Exogamy.
2. The Canon of Taboo.

According to the first, no man shall marry or cohabit with a woman of his own totem group; and under the second, members of a totem shall abstain from killing or eating the totem object. Up to the publication of Messrs. Spencer and Gillen's important work on "*The Natives of Central Australia*," these canons were regarded by Dr. Frazer as the vital elements of totemism, *sine qua non*. Since his acquaintance, however, with the data therein presented, he has been led to look with different eyes upon these "canons," and now appears doubtful of their force and validity, and in their place seems desirous of establishing a new "test," which may be termed the Canon of Provider.

As we shall presently have to refer to these "doubtful canons" in our consideration of Dr. Haddon's views, we need not stop to examine their validity here, but pass on to a consideration of the evidence upon which this later canon has been established.

It appears that among the Central Australian tribes they have a ceremony which they call *Intichiuma*, the object of which is "to provide the community with a supply of food and all other necessities by means of certain magical ceremonies, the performance of which is distributed among the various totem groups." From this custom or ceremony Dr. Frazer has been led to infer that the main object of totemism among the Central Australian tribes, and, by implication, all other totemic peoples, is to ensure the multiplication of the animals or plants of the several totem species. For after dwelling upon the *Intichiuma* ceremony he concludes thus: "Totemism among the Central Australian tribes appears, if we may judge by the *Intichiuma* ceremonies, to be an organized system of magic intended to procure for savage man a plentiful supply of all the natural objects whereof he stands in need. . . Have we not in these *Intichiuma* ceremonies the key to the original meaning and purpose of totemism among the Central Australian tribes, perhaps even of totemism in general."

In suggesting this new view of the matter Dr. Frazer seems to have abandoned the position he formerly took with regard to this question. In his earlier writings he suggested something quite different from this. Then it was the "soul-box" theory as it has been called. This

¹ Macmillan & Co., London, 1899.

view was based on the idea common in *Märchen* of an individual hiding his soul or spirit in some object or other, and thus forming a mysterious and intimate connection between himself and the object. "Here was the link," reasoned Dr. Frazer, "the relation between the individual and his tutelar spirit; here was the personal totem." This view had this much in common with the American view that it supposed the group totem to be a development from the personal totem, and here, at least, Dr. Frazer was on the right track. For to separate personal totemism from group totemism as many European students are doing, and regard them as unrelated phenomena savours it seems to me of anything but sound science. Dr. Frazer argued, and rightly we hold, that "the explanation which holds good of one kind of totem ought equally to hold good of the other"; and hence he drew the deduction that a clan or gens revered its totem and called itself after its name, because the members thereof were held to have their individual lives or souls bound up with that of their totem. The obvious objection, of course, to this explanation of totemism is, that this belief is found among so few savages who practise totemism. Dr. Frazer himself was conscious of this objection but explains it away after this manner. "How close" he argues, "must be the concealment, how impenetrable the reserve in which he," (the savage) "hides the inner keep and citadel of his being. No inducement that can be offered is likely to tempt him to imperil his soul by revealing its hiding place to a stranger." The answer to this is, that the close study of the American savage, who almost everywhere holds totem notions, by experienced students like Cushing, Dorsey, Fletcher, Powell and others, must have revealed some signs of its existence if it had formed a part of his philosophy of life or lay at the root of totemism. The question has been studied too long and too carefully for this belief, if it had ever been entertained, to have escaped discovery. For even if it had, conceivably, been everywhere systematically withheld by the natives from every white investigator who has ever gone among them, it must have been known to all Indians who held totemic notions. Yet, no Indian who has been weaned from the faith and practices of his fathers, or who has thrown off the old pagan habits and customs for those of civilized life, has ever told us a word about it. We have educated natives among us who are, equally with ourselves, keenly interested in the study of the customs and philosophy of their people, and it is not conceivable that they would know or learn nothing of such a belief, if it were the true basis and explanation of the totemism of their forefathers. This view, then, must have been set aside, even if its author had not discarded it, as he apparently has, on the ground that it is lacking in that feature which must necessarily

characterize any theory that claims to be regarded as the true explanation of totem habits and practices, viz., universal application.

We need not, then, further consider this theory, plausible as it certainly is, but return to Dr. Frazer's later hypothesis based on the Canon of Provinder. Let us now see what these *Intichiuma* ceremonies are and in what respect they differ from analogous ceremonies in this country.

According to Dr. Frazer and the authors of "*The Native Tribes of Central Australia*," they are magic rites which have for their object the increase of the totem animal or plant. Each clan is regarded as possessing direct control over the animal or plant whose name it bears; and this control is exercised for the express purpose of increasing the necessities of life.

Thus for example, "when men of the emu totem desire to multiply emus they set about it as follows: Several of the men open veins in their arms and allow the blood to stream on the ground till a patch about three yards square is saturated with it. When the blood is dry it forms a hard surface, on which the men of the totem paint in white, red, yellow and black, a design intended to represent various parts of the emu, such as the fat, of which the natives are very fond, the eggs in various stages of development, the intestines and the liver. Further, several men of the totem acting the part of ancestors of the emu clan, dress themselves up to resemble emus and imitate the movements and aimless gazing about of the bird; on their heads are fastened sacred sticks about four feet long and tipped with emu feathers, to represent the long neck and small head of the emu.

There is no need to cite further examples. The ceremonies of other clan-groups are all similar in character though they may differ in detail from that described. Now those familiar with the "rituals" of American tribes will see in these Australian ceremonies practices analogous to those found in this country. The elaborate Salmon ceremonies of the Pacific Coast tribes, for example, are parallel performances, and like the *Intichiuma*, are carried out expressly for the purpose of securing a good "run" of salmon. The wild rice ceremonies or rituals of the Menomini or wild-rice people, the Eskimo deer ceremonies, the maize or corn ceremonies, the rain and hunt rituals of the Sia and Zunis, all have the same object, the increase of the necessities of life. That the several totem groups should perform the ceremonies connected with their own totem object is exactly what we ought to find under the view of totemism here taken. We find the same division of ritual and privilege among American tribes, though not everywhere so strongly developed and systematized perhaps as they are reported to be among the Central Australian peoples.

There the "division of labour" seems to have been specialized. This would appear to be the only distinction between them and the ceremonies or rituals of our American "medicine" or "religious" societies. In all other respect they appear to correspond.

Now, in this country we do not regard the practices of "medicine" or "magic" societies or totem groups, as the sum total of totemism, but only, as I have pointed out, as one feature of it, and that probably the latest in evolution; and the chief objection in my mind against regarding the *Intichiuma* and similar ceremonies as the basis "and original meaning and purpose of totemism," is that this explanation of it does not go to the root of the matter, but still leaves us to show how the several clans or groups acquired this magic or religious power over the totem object. In short, while it gives us a plausible *raison d'être* for totemism, it fails entirely to tell us how it originated, or why it is the totem group is commonly called by the name of the totem-object.

Moreover, totemism rightly considered is not a set of practices or ceremonies, but clearly a *belief*, which is the efficient cause of these practices. Hence to attempt to judge totemism by "canons" and "tests," is to regard the *form* or expression of the doctrine rather than the informing principle or concept which underlies and prompts it, to take the shell for the kernel, and to open the door to endless differences of opinion. For although the underlying principle of totemism is one and the same everywhere, its outward expressions or manifestations are as numerous almost as the tribes among whom it is found. The only possible way by which we can arrive at harmony of view in the matter is in the recognition of the psychic side or aspect of totemism as its really essential feature. When we have done this then we may profitably go on to study and examine the different local expressions of the doctrine and note the various forms they assume in the different stages of social evolution.

Dr. A. C. Haddon is the next exponent of totemism whose views we must consider. In his presidential address before the Anthropological section of the B. A. A. S. at the Belfast meeting of last year, he remarks: "Totemism as Dr. Frazer and as I understand it in its fully developed condition implies the division of a people into several totem kins. . . . each of which has one, or sometimes more than one, totem. The totem is usually a species of animal, sometimes a species of plant, occasionally a natural object or phenomenon very rarely a manufactured object. Totemism also involves the rule of exogamy, forbidding marriage within the kin, and necessitating inter-marriage between the kins. It is essentially connected with the matriarchal stage of culture (mother-right), though it passes over into the patriarchal stage (father-right). The totems are regarded as kinsfolk and protectors and benefactors of the kinsmen, who respect them and abstain from killing and eating

them. There is thus a recognition of mutual rights and obligations between the members of the kin and their totem. The totem is the crest or symbol of the kin. To put the matter briefly, totemism consists of the following five elements:—

1. Social organization with totem kinsmen and totem symbols.
2. Reciprocal responsibilities between the kin and the totem.
3. Magical increase or repression of the totem by the kinsmen.¹
4. Social duties of the kinsmen.
5. Myths of explanation.

Totemism is only one of several animal cults."

It is plain that we are here dealing with a view of totemism that has little or nothing in common with the American view. The key to Dr. Haddon's position lies in the tail of his definition. "Totemism," he affirms "is only *one* of several animal cults," and in accordance with this view he separates the various forms or local expressions of the totemic concept into distinct cults. He will have it that the personal and society totems are not features of "true" totemism at all. Such a position is, of course, incomprehensible to American students, yet this is the view he informs us of Tylor, Frazer, Lang, Hartland, Jevons, Durkheim and many other leading anthropologists.

Now, it will be instructive to see how this view originated. It apparently arose from a misconception of the real character and purpose of totemism as that doctrine is held and understood by primitive man himself. It appears to be founded upon the preconception of the savant rather than upon the real beliefs of the savage. Totemism has been regarded as a set or code of social rules and regulations rather than as the expression of man's earliest religious feelings and sentiment. It has been confused with certain social customs and observances which have in part grown out of the totem concept, and in part have arisen quite independently of it. This is clear from both Dr. Frazer's and Dr. Haddon's definitions of totemism and from the fact that "element" after "element" and "canon" after "canon" has had to be abandoned as fresh facts have been gleaned from primitive life, and the student has been led to approach the matter from the point of view of the savage. The newer data gathered from the Central Australian tribes by Messrs. Spencer and Gillen are so strongly confirmative of the American point of view that they compel the abandonment of the most important features or elements of totemism as it is commonly conceived by English students. This will manifest itself as we examine Dr. Haddon's elements in detail which we may now proceed to do.

First, as to "social organization with totem kinsmen and totem symbols." Dr. Haddon must pardon me if I point out that here at the

¹ Dr. Frazer's "Canon" of Provinder.

beginning his first element is based on an assumption which a close study of the subject makes it difficult to justify. It is assumed as an accepted and incontrovertible fact that the social organization of savage peoples into clan groups in the matriarchal stage has its foundation in totemism. But no proof has been, or can be, given for this statement and such evidence as we can gather on the point leads to the opposite conclusion. All we certainly know of the earlier stages of human society is that hordes or bands lived together under an organization which we call matriarchy or "mother-right;" that is kinship was traced through the mother only, the most obvious and the most certain form of relationship. Now, it is clear that the recognition of uterine ties must bind the mother to her offspring and them to her in closer bond than any other. Again, uterine brothers and sisters are a naturally defensive and co-operative group and spontaneously aid each other to avenge insults and redress wrongs. Here then, we probably have the pristine unit of social organization. But the mother of this "family" is also uterine sister to other sisters and brothers; therefore her "family" is connected by ties of blood to other "families." Now, the aggregation of these blood-related "families" constitutes a wider group, and this is the clan of matriarchy. Clans are confessedly blood-related groups, and this bond or union is everywhere seen to be based on this kinship of blood. The formation of clans, then, has nothing to do with totems, and it is not the common totem, which is inherited from the founder of the clan, that makes the members of the clan kinsmen. Clans, then, are purely social groups held together by the common tie of blood; and may, and most certainly do, exist as such, apart from any totem concept. The totem is obviously a later feature, and is in no sense an essential part of the clan structure. So much is this seen to be the case that Dr. F. Boas,¹ a most cautious and experienced investigator, has remarked that the earlier social grouping of the Haida and Tlingit appears to have been on lines similar to the communal organization of the more southern tribes, as the clans so frequently bear territorial names instead of totem names. Wemiaminow and Krause also noted that certain Tlingit clans were called after the localities where their communal houses stood. Indeed, it is a common practice with the Haida and Tlingit to call their clans after the names of their houses or the places where they are erected. And yet these tribes have a strictly matriarchal organization with group totems. It is not safe, then, to affirm that totemism implies the division of a people into *totem-kins*; the kinship is not totemic but always consanguineous. Totemism *per se* has nothing to do with clan structure.

Another feature of element No. I is the rule of exogamy. "Totemism," says Dr. Haddon, "involves the rule of exogamy, forbidding mar-

¹ See Fifth Report on N.W. Tribes of Canada, B.A.A.S., 1899.

riage within the kin and necessitating inter-marriage between the kins." But is this really a feature of totemism? It is true it has become in a measure associated with totemism, but is not this accidental? Is it not because the endogamous or incest group is the same thing as the clan group? We have seen that the formation of the clan group was independent of totemism, and are we not thereby justified in inferring that the endogamous group, which is the same body, was equally independent of totemic concepts? Such evidence as we may gather on the point certainly supports this view. Marriages among the tribes of America are universally regulated by customary law which appears to have had its origin quite apart from totemism. It appears to be based on political considerations rather than upon any other. Marriage ties were bonds employed to unite different clans into larger bodies such as the tribe. These bodies were primarily political corporations, their union having for its object a permanent alliance for offensive and defensive purposes. "Make ye marriages with us: give your daughters unto us and take our daughters unto you," said Hamor of old to Jacob, and we can well believe that many Hamors before and since have uttered the same words. Agreements or treaties of this kind enforced for a generation or two crystalize into customary law which later may be thought to have received the sanction of the clan or tribal deities and so to have become sacred. But is this totemism? I cannot think so. If the canon of exogamy were of totemic origin, surely we ought to find a uniformity of practice and observance. But this is by no means the case. American tribal society presents us with totem groups living under endogamous regulation and marrying strictly within the family or totem group. And the same thing is found in Australia.

Messrs. Spencer and Gillen have shown that among some of the Central Australian tribes, totemism has no effect upon marriage or descent, a man being free to marry a woman of his own totem or any other as he desires or thinks fit, and his offspring may belong to either his own or his wife's clan, or they may belong to neither, or part in one and part in another as fancy and circumstances shall dictate, and the traditions of these tribes "seem to point back to a time when a man always married a woman of his own totem. The reference to men and women of one totem always living together in groups would appear to be too frequent and explicit to admit of any other satisfactory explanation. We never meet with an instance of a man living with a woman who was not of his own totem."¹ "Such traditions," remarks Dr. Frazer in his consideration of Messrs. Spencer and Gillen's work, "it is plain, fly straight in the face of all our old notions of totemism. Are we, therefore, at liberty to reject them as baseless? Certainly not. Their very

¹ *The Native Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 419.

discordance with the practice of the natives at the present day is the best guarantee that they contain a substantial element of truth. They could not have been invented to explain customs which they contradict. Every theory of Central Australian totemism [and I may add of any other totemism] must reckon with them; none can be satisfactory which does not show how the gulf between the present and past totemic system of the natives may be bridged."¹

In this view of the matter I entirely concur with Dr. Frazer, and would here desire to point out to him that the American view of totemism offers the most satisfactory of bridges and reconciles without violence of any kind, in the simplest and most effective manner this seemingly discordant feature of "Australian totemism."

Dr. Haddon has of course considered these disturbing data from Central Australia too; indeed, he has himself called attention to similar discordant practices among the Papuans and other Pacific Islanders. He remarks in this connection:—"Among some Papuans marriage restrictions are territorial and not totemic. Dr. Rivers has shown that in Murray Island, eastern tribe of Torres Straits, marriages are regulated by the places to which the natives belong. A man cannot marry a woman of his own village, or of certain other villages. . . . A similar custom occurs in the Mekeo district of British New Guinea, and it is probably still more widely distributed. I was informed by a member of the Yaraikanua tribe of Cape York, North Queensland, that children must take the 'land' or 'country' of their mother; all who belong to the same place are brothers and sisters, a wife must be taken from another 'country'; thus it appears their marriage restrictions are territorial and not totemic. The same is found amongst the Kurnai and the Coast Murring tribe of New South Wales. . . At Kiwai, in the delta of the Fly River, B.N.G., all the members of a totemic group live together in a long house which is confined to that group. I have also collected evidence which proves there was a territorial grouping of totemic clans among the western tribe of Torres Straits."

But these practices, so discordant with the "Rule of Exogamy," do not affect Dr. Haddon in the same manner as they do Dr. Frazer. He still holds to his five "elements," and explains these breaches of his rule by regarding them as some of the steps by which the savage passes out of totemism.² In offering this suggestion Dr. Haddon seems to have overlooked the evidence of those traditions of the Arunta, gathered by Messrs. Spencer and Gillen, which shows that in the early days of the tribe "a man always married a woman of his own totem"; for it

¹ *Fortnightly Review*, 1899, p. 656.

² See his remarks on this head in his Address, page 14. *Transactions of Section H., Brit. Assoc., Belfast, 1902.*

does not appear to me to be susceptible of such an explanation as he has offered.

Regarding, then, the evidence on this head from America, from Australia and from Torres Straits, British Guinea and the other Pacific centres, offered by Dr. Haddon himself, it seems to me impossible to maintain that exogamy is a canon, rule, or essential element of totemism. The most that can be said for it is, that it is a fairly common concomitant of it, and that it appears to have received the sanction of the totemic deity. But this we can satisfactorily account for without regarding it as an essential part of totemism.

The common European view of exogamy seems to be the outcome of the theory of endogamy and exogamy first profounded by McLennan. For following him others of the earlier writers on marriage customs in tribal society, "culled from the literature of travels a vast body of stories about taboos in marriage; and it was finally concluded that certain tribes required their tribesmen to marry women who were foreigners and aliens. This was called exogamy. Then it was held that other tribes required or permitted their tribesmen to take wives within the tribe; and this was called endogamy. So an attempt was made to classify the tribes of mankind, not only in America but elsewhere, into two groups, the exogamous and the endogamous.

Now we understand that in all tribal society there is an endogamous, or incest, group, which we call the clan in savagery and the gens in barbarism; while, at the same time, the clansmen usually marry within the tribe *by regulations which vary greatly from people to people*. It seems that the ties of marriage are used to bind different peoples together in one larger group which we call the tribe, and that the clans of a tribe may at one time have been distinct tribes; that when tribes become weak or desire to form permanent alliances with other tribes for offensive and defensive purposes, such tribes agree to become clans of a united body and by treaty confirm the bargain, by pledging not to marry within their own groups, but to exchange women with one another. . . . Such a bargain or treaty enforced for many generations as customary law, ultimately becomes sacred and marriage within the group is incest. Perhaps there is no people, tribal or national, which has not an incest group; so all peoples are endogamous as all peoples are necessarily exogamous."¹

Such were the views held and expressed by Major Powell regarding the origin of endogamous and exogamous regulations, and in default of a better may well be accepted as the explanation most in harmony with the facts of the case.

¹ Sociology, or the Science of Institutions, W. J. Powell. Amer. Anthropol., pp. 703-4, N.S., I, 1899.

Second. "Reciprocal responsibilities between the kin and the totem"—in other words "the totems are regarded as kinsfolk and protectors, or benefactors of the kinamen who respect them and abstain from killing and eating them." Here, Dr. Haddon is in some respects on safer ground. The totems are naturally, for obvious reasons, treated with respect and regarded as the "protectors" or "benefactors" of the individual and the totem group. But when he claims that they are commonly regarded as kinsfolk, using that term in its ordinary sense, and that the kinsmen refrain from killing and eating them, we have again what appears more like an over-hasty generalization of the savant rather than the actual belief and practices of the savage, and Dr. Haddon will find it extremely difficult to maintain this view in face of the array of opposing evidence which later ethnological research furnishes on this head. This is so strong, that from a consideration of a portion of it from one source alone—the Central Australian—Dr. Frazer has been led to set aside his Canon of Taboo and regard this rule of abstention as having no important bearing upon totemism, or at most to be only a later subsidiary feature of it. The traditions of the Arunta represent their ancestors as possessing and freely exercising the right to kill and eat their totem animals and plants, "as if this were indeed a functional necessity."¹ And American data fully bear out the truth and reliability of these traditions. Yet, Dr. Haddon makes no reference to these discordances with his "elements" in his address, nor does his theory of totemism attempt to explain them, which, as Dr. Frazer has observed, every theory of totemism is bound to do.

The study of this question of taboo from the point of view of American evidence, has led me to the conclusion that the practice of abstaining from killing and eating the totem object, when an edible one, arises *in part only* from the supposed relation existing between the totem and the possessor or possessors of it. It is seen to be mainly the outcome of the animistic philosophy of savage man and his belief regarding the animal and vegetal world. Among all American tribes, no matter what their social structure may be—clan, gens, or village community, we find numerous and curious rules and regulations and taboos regarding the slaying, gathering and eating of animals and plants, which are quite independent of totemism, the explanation of which becomes measurably clear to us, when we bear in mind the universal attitude of savage man towards the universe, as we have seen it revealed to us by Cushing and other sympathetic students of primitive life.

The origin of these food taboos and restrictions arises primarily from the savage's strong belief in the "mysterious" powers of animals and plants; and the practice of them was originally, whatever it may

¹ *The Natives Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 209.

have been later, intended to propitiate them. This is clear from the study of the subject. Among the Thompson Indians of British Columbia, a tribe where group-totemism of any kind seems to be wholly unknown, we find numerous taboos relating to the killing and eating of animals and plants which differ in no essential from the so-called taboos of totemism. For example, when a lad killed his first deer he never ate it himself but always gave it to the people to eat. When a hunter killed a deer it was said the rest of the deer would be well pleased if the hunter butchered the animal nicely and cleanly. To waste the meat of a deer displeased the animals who would not in consequence allow themselves thereafter to be shot by the hunter. If a hunter was overburdened and had to leave behind some of the meat of the deer, it was said that the deer were better pleased to have the meat of their fellow hung up in a tree rather than left on the ground. The intestines of the quarry which in some cases were not taken away by the hunter were collected and placed where the blood had been spilt while butchering. The whole was then covered with a few fir boughs, the hunter in the meantime bidding the deer not to be sorry at the death of their companion or because some portion of its body had been left behind, since he had done his best to cover it up. If the hunter neglected to cover the remains it was believed that the rest of the deer would feel sorry or angry and would cause him bad luck in hunting. If a deer-hunting party had bad luck they remained at their camp for a few days, sweat-bathing, singing and praying to their guardian spirit to give them success and also asking the deer to present themselves to be shot at. No hunter would give a deer's head to, nor would he eat with, a man who was the first or second born of a family. The deer, it was believed, would become very wild and difficult to shoot, if he did so. Deer meat was never taken in through the common door or entrance of a lodge because the common door was used by women. When the father of an adolescent girl began to hunt the deer always ran away from him. A bear hunter often addressed the prey and begged it to come and be shot at. The grizzly bear was asked not to be angry with the hunter nor to fight him, but rather to take pity upon him and deliver himself up to him. When a man killed a bear he and his companions with him painted their faces and sang the bear song. Sometimes he prayed also thanking the bear for letting himself be killed. When the flesh of the bear's head had been eaten the skull was tied to a small tree top and left there. If this were neglected the bears would take offence. Placing the heads of any large animal on trees or rocks was a mark of respect. A hunter never talked lightly or made fun of any animal he intended to hunt or trap. He always spoke of it in respectful tones and said,

"I may kill it," never, "I shall kill it." All young people when eating the first berries, roots or other products of the earth addressed a prayer to the Sunflower-Root, thus:—"I inform thee that I intend to eat thee. Mayest thou always help me to ascend, so that I may always be able to reach the tops of mountains and may I never be clumsy! I ask this from thee, O Sunflower-Root. Thou art the greatest of all in mystery."¹ These examples might be supplemented by scores of others from other American tribes. The taboos and restriction in food imposed upon menstruating women, upon widows, widowers and orphans, all belong to the same class and have a similar significance. The First Fruits ceremonies of the Fraser River tribes, the many customs connected with the salmon all show the same beliefs in the mysterious powers of animals and plants; and the various restrictions or taboos all have the same object—the propitiation of the spirits or ghosts of the animals or plants.

It is not in totemism *qua* totemism, then, that we should look for the explanation of taboos of this kind, but in the savage's general animistic conceptions of nature. They are the natural outgrowth of his anthropopathic apprehension of things, and are only incidentally connected with totemism.

With regard to the claims of kinship between the totem and the totem-group, Dr. Haddon seems to overlook entirely the large body of contrary evidence on this head gathered by Dr. Boas from the Northwest tribes and by other students elsewhere. I do not see how any one familiar with the later American evidence in this connection can hold that the totem object is commonly regarded by the totem-group as the ancestor and founder of their clan. I know this was the earlier view even of American students, but this has been generally modified by later and wider research. It is true the totems are usually addressed by the natives themselves as "grandfather" or "grandmother," but these terms, as most students are aware, among primitive races are more terms of respect than terms of relationship. When an Indian wishes to show regard to a person or an animal he always addresses him by a title indicative of superior age, such as elder brother, uncle, father, grandfather or the like. This custom I suspect, before it was properly understood, had a great deal to do with misleading unwary students, and possibly even the savages themselves, at times, into thinking that the totem object was the ancestor and founder of the clan or gens. The true relation between the totem object and the totem-group will be invariably found to be the same as that existing between the individual and his personal totem—a relation of "mystery" not of blood. I

¹ The Thompson Indians of B.C., by J. Tait. *Memoirs of the Amer. Mus. of Nat. Hist.*, Vol. II, p. 346, *et seq.*

have already shown that the taking or assuming the name of a totem or tutelary spirit implies relationship with it, but not that of ancestor and descendant.

Third. Magical increase or repression of the ~~token~~ ^{totem} by the kinsmen. This is an element added to totemism since the publication of Messrs. Spencer and Gillen's researches among the Central Tribes of Australia. It has reference to the *Intichiuma* ceremonies, the same that led Dr. Frazer to discard his "canons" of exogamy and taboo. We have seen that these ceremonies are peculiar to "religious" or "medicine" societies in America and constitute but a single aspect of totemism. They are not a feature of clan or gentile totemism at all from the American point of view, but like the taboos and restrictions we have just considered are the natural outcome of savage philosophy. Major Powell has given a very lucid description of them in his paper on Sociology, which as it bears directly upon Dr. Haddon's third "element" I shall take the liberty of citing in part here. He remarks:—In savagery there are societies which are organized for the purpose of securing the co-operation of ghosts in the affairs of mankind. These societies are often called phratries or brotherhoods, and are the custodians of the lore of unseen beings. They occupy themselves with ceremonies and various practices intended to secure advantages and to avert evils which are attributed to multitudinous ghostly beings which are supposed to have tenuous bodies and to live an occult and magical life as they take part in human affairs. Everything unexplained is attributed to ghosts. . . . These phratries, which are organized to obtain the assistance of ghosts, develop periodical ceremonies which are designed to secure the annual productions of nature upon which human welfare depends. Thus the fishing tribes of the Pacific Coast that depend largely for their food on the coming of the salmon from the sea at stated times, have ceremonies designed to secure their coming; those that depend upon cereals, like wild rice, also have their ceremonies to invoke the aid of ghosts to bring abundant seed. In arid lands, where vegetation is so dependent upon rain, these ceremonies take the form of invocations for rain. Thus in every region of the United States periodical ceremonies are performed to secure harvests and supplies of game.¹

It will be seen from these citations that these ceremonies are no part of clan totemism among American savages; and with all due respect to Australian students it is open to question whether the *Intichiuma* ceremonies are not best explained, as Major Powell held, by regarding them as observances of "religious," "medicine" or "magical"

¹ *Sociology, or the Science of Institutions*. Amer. Anth., N.S., I, 1899, pp. 710-1.

societies or brotherhoods rather than as observances, or ceremonies performed by the whole clans.

Fourth. Social duties of the kinsmen, that is to say the kinsman looks to his brother kinsmen for sympathy and assistance in trouble or need. Here again I am constrained to ask: "Is this totemism?" As I have shown, the clan is a blood-connected group, and its members naturally and spontaneously aid and help one another. Their very connection prompts and suggests this. It is a world-wide universal practice, and I cannot see that totemism has anything to do with it. We find exactly the same custom prevailing among the "families" of the Salish and other tribes whose organization is neither clannish, gentile nor totemic. Surely this "element" has the least right of any to be considered an essential feature of totemism.

Fifth. Myths of explanation. Here again I fail to see why this should be regarded as an "element" of totemism, when that which is much more characteristic of that doctrine—personal and society totems—are rigidly excluded in Dr. Haddon's definition. It is true most peoples have myths explaining or accounting for the origin of their totems, but I marvel that Dr. Haddon should claim these among his elements as they so invariably show that the group or clan totem was originally a personal or individual totem of the founder of the clan, a form or feature of totemism he deliberately rejects. Moreover, myths of explanation are not peculiar to totemism, they run through the whole body of tribal habits, customs and beliefs, and the myths explaining the origin of totems differ in no essential from the myths explaining the origin of the tribe or cosmos.

Thus, it is clear, there is little of totemism, when it is rightly regarded, in Dr. Haddon's five "elements"; from which it is seen that he has considered the social accessories and later accidents of totemism rather than the psychic content of the doctrine itself. That he, and those who hold like views with him, are justified in their position by the facts of the case, I cannot persuade myself, nor do I see that we arrive at any better understanding of the matter by setting up a form of so-called "true" or "typical" totemism,—which appears to me to be fashioned more after the preconceived ideas of a cultivated European than after the ideas of an American or Australian savage,—than by seeking to comprehend the principle or concept that lies at the base of the doctrine. To my mind, the apprehension of the efficient cause of totemism leads to a better understanding of the doctrine in all its manifestations than any vision of totemism in its "fully developed condition," and I submit that we may derive more profit from our consideration of the subject when all "animal cults" are considered as only so many local phases or expressions of one and the same fundamental concept, as they de-

monstrably are, rather than as different and distinct cults, as Dr. Haddon would have us regard them. To separate individual totemism from group or "typical" totemism seems to me to cut ourselves off from the very heart and root of the matter, from the only evidence that can possibly help us to understand the purpose and meaning of totemism. It is like asking the student of chemistry to be satisfied with his compounds and not seek to discover the elements that lie at their base.

As Dr. Haddon has informed us in his address that his view of totemism is that "understood by Tylor, Frazer, Lang, Hartland, Jevons, Durkheim and others," it becomes unnecessary to criticize the views of these gentlemen. We may at once pass on to examine the "suggestion concerning the origin of totemism" put forward by Dr. Haddon in the latter part of his address, and also the "guess" of Mr. Andrew Lang concerning "the origin of totem names and beliefs."¹ This "suggestion" of Dr. Haddon does not so much deal with the origin of totemism as I and other American students understand that doctrine, as with the origin of totem-group names. Thus, he remarks: "I take this opportunity to hazard a suggestion for a possible origin of one aspect of totemism. Primitive human groups, judging from analogy could never have been large, and the individuals comprising each group must have been closely related. In favourable areas each group would have a tendency to occupy a restricted range owing to the disagreeable results which arose from encroaching on the territory over which another group wandered. Thus it would inevitably come about that a certain animal or plant, or group of animals or plants would be more abundant in the territory of one group than in that of another. To take a clear example, the shore-folk and the river-folk would live mainly on different food from each other, and both would have other specialties than fell to the lot of the jungle-folk. The groups that lived on the seashore would doubtless have some natural vegetable product to supplement their animal diet, but the supply would probably be limited alike in quantity and variety. Even they would scarcely have unlimited range of a shore line and there would be one group of shore-folk that had a specialty in crabs, another would have shad-beds, while a third would own sandy shores which were frequented by turtles. A similar natural grouping would occur among the jungle-folk: sago flourishes in swampy land, certain animals frequent grassy plains, others inhabit the dense scrub, bamboos grow in one locality, various kinds of fruit trees thrive best in different soils; the coastal plains, the foot hills, the mountains, each has its characteristic flora and fauna. There is thus no difficulty in accounting for numerous small human groups, each of which would be largely dependent upon a distinctive food supply, the

¹ *Folk-Lore*, Vol. XIII, No. 4, December 25th, 1902.

superfluity of which could be bartered for the superfluities of other groups Among the shore-folk the group that lived mainly on crabs and occasionally traded in crabs might well be spoken of as "crab men" by all groups with whom they came in direct or indirect contact. The same would hold good for the group that dealt in clams or in turtles, and reciprocally there might be sago-men, bamboo-men, and so forth. It is obvious that men who persistently collected or hunted a particular group of animals would understand the habits of these animals better than other people, and a personal regard for these animals would naturally arise. Thus, from the very beginning, there would be a distinct relationship between a group of individuals and a group of animals or plants, relationship that primitively was based, not on even the most elementary of psychic concepts, but on the most deeply seated and urgent of human claims, hunger."

The point that strikes one first in this suggestion is that it knocks all to pieces the "Canon of Taboo," which is included in Dr. Haddon's second "element." Dr. Haddon is, of course, aware of this and explains it away by remarking that his suggestion "deals with incipient totemism" only. This again is, of course, an incomprehensible position from the American point of view, but it serves admirably to show that English students regard the social concomitants of totemism as its essential features—a view, as I have shown, impossible to hold if we would rightly understand this phenomenon of savage life.

Now the objections that arise in my mind as I consider this hypothesis are several and some of them deep-rooted.

First, these names come from *without*; they are not taken or assumed by the groups themselves, but are applied to them by the neighbouring groups. And while we have numerous instances of nick-names being given both to individuals and tribes by their neighbours, I can recall no instance where these names have been recognized and adopted by the individuals or groups thus named. Endless tribes and division of this country have had names descriptive of their habitat, the food upon which they chiefly live, their mental or physical characteristics, etc., bestowed upon them; but in no case that I can discover have those names been recognized or adopted by the people themselves; and to apply these names to them to their faces is to deeply insult them and wound their self-respect.

Secondly. If this were the true origin of group names we ought to find ample evidence of it in the names themselves. Now, a study of clan names as they obtain in America gives little support to Dr. Haddon's theory. For while they are generally called after the names of the objects of the *present* environment of the clan or group or tribe, (and this is a highly significant fact which has been too much overlooked in our

considerations of the subject), these objects are by no means commonly, such as are suitable for food, and Dr. Haddon's explanation of these does not appear satisfactory to me.

Thirdly. As I have just pointed out, the names of totem groups are invariably found to be the names of the objects that are natural to the locality where the clan groups reside. Now we know from historical records, to say nothing of the tradition of the natives themselves, that a very general displacement of tribes has taken place all over the American continent, and this within comparatively recent times; yet in every case, I believe I am right in saying, the totem names of both *individuals* and *groups* are names of objects characteristic of their present environment, many of which in numerous instances must have been quite unknown in the earlier habitat. What, then, is the legitimate conclusion deducible from these facts? Is it not that the names of some clan groups, at least, are comparatively modern and date at earliest from the first presence of the clan in its present territories? This does not agree with Dr. Haddon's hypothesis which expressly supposes the totem names to have arisen in the earlier days of man's history, when he dwelt in small, more or less, isolated groups in restricted areas. But it appears to me to support strongly the view I have advocated, that totem groups and new clans may arise at any time in the history of tribal society, and that the personal totem gives rise to the group totem. Tribes as a general rule increase in number, with the lapse of time and new clans spring into existence, after the manner of the Bear clan of the Tsimshian. How else are we to account for the presence of totem-group names which have clearly arisen since the settlement of the tribe in its present quarters, as they are called by the names of objects known and common to their present, but not to their former place of residence. But these objections, strong as they are, I regard as comparatively minor. My chief and invincible objection lies in the total disregard of this hypothesis for the *psychic* factors of totemism, which my study of the question has compelled me to look upon as all-important and essential to the doctrine. I fail entirely to see how the evidence brought together by American and other students regarding savage man's mental attitude towards the universe can be set aside or neglected in any discussion of totemism. Life and nature are full of mystery to the savage from his birth to his death, but Dr. Haddon's theory wholly overlooks and ignores this and bases the origin of a doctrine which is confessedly full of "mystery" upon the common-place, un-mysterious feeling of hunger. Again, I must be pardoned if my personal knowledge of the workings of the primitive mind prompts me to say this is more the view of a cultivated European than that of a superstitious savage. It is altogether too matter-of-fact for the mind of primitive man, who sees in the commonest and simplest

object before and about him an incomprehensible and awe-compelling mystery. Totemism was born and cradled in the savage's ever-present sense of mystery, whatever it may have since become, and any hypothesis which ignores this feature of savage life must necessarily fail in its purpose. In this all students of primitive philosophy will assuredly agree.

The objections I have urged against Dr. Haddon's "suggestion," apply with equal or greater force to the "guess" of Mr. Lang, the main feature of which is, that the names are always given "*from without*." Mr. Lang's line of argument is as follows:—"At first the human groups were 'anonymous,' that is bore no special designations. Every group would speak of itself as 'the men,' while it would know neighbouring groups as 'the others.' But this arrangement lacks distinctness. Each group would need a special name for each of the neighbouring tribes." Mr. Lang does not mind how the name arises. It may be given in derision, or it may be based on some fancied or real group-traits of character, good or bad, or applied from any cause whatever, provided only that it come "*from without*." This is the vital point of his theory. The main support Mr. Lang offers for this view, is gathered from the practices of modern English and continental villagers. I have to admit that he gives us much interesting information regarding the names of derision applied by the people of one village to those of another, but he fails entirely, as far as I have been able to see, to show us that these villagers called *themselves* by these terms, or recognized or admitted them in any way. I was myself born and bred in the west country and my recollection of these nick-names is that the boys of one village would fight with the boys of another just because they cast these names in each other's teeth. Mr. Lang gives us a lengthy list of these village names, of which the following are examples:—

Ashley	Monkeys.
Yarby	Geese.
Watworth	Bulldogs.
Fenton	Rooks.
Wickley	Tigers.
Oakditch	Potato-grubs.
St. Aldate's	Fools.
Hillborough	Mice.
Miltown	Mules (formerly "rats")
Loughton	Cuckoos.

But will Mr. Lang assure us that these villagers called themselves by these names, or admitted them as applicable to them for a moment? I think he will find that they are invariably indignantly repudiated by one and all. Mr. Lang cites the term "Eskimo" as another example,

and remarks that this name was applied to the Arctic races in America by the neighbouring Indians; but Mr. Lang should surely be aware that no Eskimo native ever calls himself, or rather speaks of himself by this term, but always by his own name of Inuit or its equivalent. I could cite scores of cases of names applied by one Indian tribe to another, but I know of no single instance where those tribes have ever adopted and assumed them, and the only evidence Mr. Lang himself offers that any of those sobriquets "stick" and become recognized and adopted by the people to whom they are applied, is that drawn from the practice of schoolboys of the present day. He remarks: "Each group would, I suggest, evolve animal and vegetable nicknames for each neighbouring group. Finally some names would 'stick,' would be stereotyped, and each group would answer to its nickname just as Pussy Moncrief, or Bull-dog Irving or Piggy Fraser or Cow Maitland does at school."¹ But even accepting this kind of evidence seriously, Mr. Lang forgets that the cases are not parallel. The schoolboy cannot help himself; when his seniors or his physical superiors address him by his nickname, he *has* to answer to it or be kicked; but does the youth pride himself on his nickname and desire that he shall be known in the family circle by it, and thereafter retain it? Mr. Lang will pardon me if I say that to my mind his hypothesis is truly a "guess" and nothing more. I am bound to remind him, too, that he found fault with the evidence Miss Fletcher, I, and other American students offered for the origin of group-totems taken from savage tribes immeasurably nearer to the primitive condition of mankind than his European villagers and Scotch schoolboys, and rejected it on the ground that these tribes had passed beyond the matriarchal state. What shall be said then for his main evidence, which is drawn from modern English and French villages and from schoolboys life? Mr. Lang may claim that he has offered evidence from American tribes under patriarchy, from the same stock, indeed, from which Miss Fletcher drew her evidence. But even granting the validity of this evidence, or rather Mr. Lang's interpretation of it, which I am unable to do, as it appears to me to be founded upon a misconception, why, I would ask, should Mr. Lang desire to refer to the customs of the Siouan tribes in support of his theory, and preclude Miss Fletcher or others from doing the same? Of the two classes of evidence, the superior cogency of that of Miss Fletcher must be apparent to anybody.

Now I submit, in conclusion, that the view of totemism here advocated suggests at the same time an origin for totem group-names that does no violence to the modes of savage thought and reasoning, and

¹ The origin of Totem Names and Beliefs. Trans. Folk-Lore, Vol. VIII, No. 4, 1902, p. 386.

which is strictly in harmony with all lines of evidence upon the point, and may well be regarded as the true origin. We have seen that names mean vastly more to the savage than to ourselves. A name with him, as I have shown, is a "mystery" thing, not a mere mark or label; and he who assumes or takes the name of a thing, animate or inanimate, animal, plant, object or element, is thought to partake of the nature of the spirit of that object, and to be bound to, or connected with, it in a very special and mysterious manner. As Miss Fletcher has shown, the personal totem name indicates the protecting presence of a deity or tutelar spirit and close connection with it; and as the attitude, as we have seen, of the member of a group towards the common totem is always the same as that of the individual to his totem, it may justly be inferred that the relation is the same and arose in like manner; and that the group name is the totem name of the ancestor who founded the family, group, or clan, and transmitted the totem or protecting presence and powers of the tutelar spirit. The character of the group-totem is everywhere seen to be the same as that of the personal totem, therefore, the explanation of the one may justly be regarded as the explanation of the other, more particularly, as I have shown that the personal totem undoubtedly *does* give rise to the family and group-totem.

If Dr. Haddon, Mr. Lang and other European anthropologists will study the nature and significance of *nomenclology* as it is found among American tribesmen, I am fain to believe they will be led to take the views here advocated. It may be observed that it is no argument to urge that names are not regarded by savages in other countries as they are by the American tribesmen, for we are not at all certain that they are not, and the probability is that they are. Other savage races have not received the same close study as those of this continent, and it was not till students had spent many years of investigation among the American Indians, that they began to understand and perceive the deep significance names had for them.

I desire finally to say that I have been prompted to the writing of this paper by the desire to assist European students of totemism to understand better the view commonly held by American students; for I think it is clear from the criticisms upon Major Powell's article in *Man*,¹ that the evidence upon which that view is founded has not been

¹ The purport of this article has been somewhat misunderstood. It was never intended as a deliberate presentation of the views taken of totemism in America, but was written in consequence of, and immediately after, the appearance of Dr. Frazer's article on the discordant data from Australia in the *Fortnightly Review* for April and May, 1899, although not published till last year in *Man*, and should be read in the light of that article. Its intention was rather to show that when totemism is rightly regarded as a system of

duly appreciated by European anthropologists, nor received the consideration at their hands that it merits. Perhaps I am presumptuous in undertaking the task; but if a decade's contact with savage races and a close study of their habits, customs and modes of thought be any qualification for the undertaking, I may, at least, claim that.

naming, in the sense in which the savage regards names, and not as a system of social rules and regulations, as held by most European students, the data from Australian and other sources which compelled the majority of European anthropologists to reconsider their position, fall naturally into place in the American conception of things, and cause no embarrassment to the American student whatever; and in this, as I have tried to show, he was quite right.